

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 22, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we praise You and give You thanks for the glories of a new day and for the many blessings You have showered down upon us.

We come to You, aware of our sins and shortcomings. We have done those things we should not have done, and have failed to do much that we should. We beg Your forgiveness.

Give us an assurance of Your pardon, and the strength to meet the challenges and temptations of a new day.

Make us open to new truth, and bless us, we pray, with a fresh sense of Your grace. Give us the insight to discern Your will in our lives, and the courage to seek and follow Your will in all that we do.

In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FDIC FINANCES GROW BLEAKER

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, FDIC Chairman Seidman testified that the fund declined by 15 percent in the first quarter of 1991. This is on top of the 23-percent average rate at which FDIC has declined in the previous 3 years.

Seidman also more than doubled his projection of FDIC losses. He now projects as much as an \$11 billion deficit by the end of 1992, compared to his \$4.6 billion deficit prediction of 6 short months ago.

FDIC losses hit an all-time high last year, with a negative net income of \$4.85 billion. Nevertheless, the assets of troubled banks jumped by an incredible 74 percent to an all-time high of \$409 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the FDIC is in deep, deep trouble. I am concerned that the restructuring bill reported out of the Banking Committee last month doesn't do enough to protect the taxpayer from bailing out the FDIC. That is why I voted against this legislation.

Our two primary objectives should be to protect the taxpayers and recapitalize FDIC. The sooner we accomplish these tasks, the better. If other parts of this package will slow down our two primary objectives, then we should put them on the back burner.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA STUDY MUST GO FORWARD

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today, as chairwoman of Children, Youth, and Families, I am sending a letter to Secretary Sullivan. I am very sorry I have to send it.

I was so saddened by his courage meltdown when the right wing came after him, and he stopped a very, very important study that had already been funded by the University of North Carolina dealing with adolescents and sex. Yes, I know it is a very difficult issue to deal with, but in the 1980's, the number of teen pregnancies doubled in this country. That is a terrible trend.

In the 1980's, the increase in the STD's, sexually transmitted diseases, increased to absolutely an epidemic level. That is a terrible trend.

We need answers. This study was very carefully crafted by people who knew what they were doing and was only targeting children who were already into these kinds of activities to try and find out what put them there. It was not trying to drive other kids in there, but to try and see what we could do to correct that behavior.

I certainly hope Secretary Sullivan looks at this. This is one of the biggest health problems we have in this country, and it has been neglected for so long. It has been funded, and I certainly hope he gets it back on track.

TRIBUTE TO BALLARD HIGH SCHOOL, LOUISVILLE, KY, MIXED CHOIR

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning at 7 o'clock, Ms. Sandy Allen, who is the principal of Ballard High School in Jefferson County, Louisville, KY, received a phone call, an international phone call, and the message was from her students who constitute the choir, the mixed choir, of Ballard High School.

The message was, "We have won Vienna, the city of music; we have won Vienna, the city of music."

What the message, cryptic as it was, meant was that the 55 young men and women who constitute Ballard's mixed choir won both the best of the festival for mixed choirs as well as a special prize for its performance in the prestigious Vienna International Youth and Music Festival.

I just want to take a moment to complement those 55 young men and women, Mr. Perry Duckett, who is their music director, and all of the people who took part in that wonderful adventure, and it was an adventure, 2 years in the making, involving each of the young people having to raise money for their transportation, and to salute them as a member of the community and as a Member of Congress.

We are very proud of you. You have brought great respect and dignity to our community.

VIETNAM GOVERNMENT MUST STOP REPRESSING RELIGION

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that last November I was in Hanoi speaking with the Foreign Minister of Vietnam and that he had assured me that Vietnam was turning over a new leaf. He assured me that in the new Vietnam there would be freedom of religion.

Why this is ironic is because one of my own constituents has just been arrested by the Communist government in Vietnam for giving out Bibles that were translated into Vietnamese. Two Orange County residents, Americans of Vietnamese descent, have been held by the Communist government in Vietnam since July 2.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

This outrage cannot be let to sit without action on our Government's part. The fact is that two Americans are in a Communist jail for doing nothing more than preaching the Gospel.

If we are to have normalized relations with Vietnam, they are going to have to stop this type of activity against American citizens, but also they are going to have to stop repressing their own Christian community. We cannot have normalization of relations in any way with a Communist government like Vietnam if they continue to persecute their own Christian community, and the message has got to go out from all Americans that there are two Americans being held in a Vietnam prison; they are not alone.

In situations like this, all Americans stand together.

The Vietnamese Government should release Rev. Taun Phuc Ma and Rev. Ni Van Ho, American citizens who were doing nothing more than practicing their God-given rights of freedom of religion, and that freedom should be extended to all people everywhere including the Vietnamese people.

□ 1210

BILL CONTINUES CURRENT EDWARD BYRNE FEDERAL/LOCAL SPLIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I dropped a bill in the hopper which I would like to just momentarily talk about, with the hope of encouraging my colleagues to support the bill.

My bill would continue permanently the current 75 percent Federal/25 percent local sharing arrangement for the Edward Byrne money, in that title of the section of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

The Edward Byrne section deals with law enforcement assistance in the anti-drug effort. Currently, by reason of 1-year extensions, the split of money is 75 percent which is advanced by the Federal Government, and 25 percent which is the local share. As of October 1 of this year, unless the extension is continued permanently or temporarily, the formula will revert to a 50 to 50 split.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, under all the circumstances today, for local governments to provide the money which they need for purely local activities, or in the case of antidrug efforts, those which are partly Federal and partly local. They are strained in the resources which they have at their disposal, and they are obviously searching out as many new ways to raise local revenues as possible.

If the 50 to 50 split were to be ordered this coming October 1, I am led to be-

lieve by reliable information from my friends at home in Louisville and Jefferson County, that their ability to cooperate in these Edward Byrne grants would be severely limited. With that would go the possibility of continuing what has been a very valiant and a very successful effort at home, to fight the war against drugs and drug abuse, and the violence in the streets which goes with drugs and drug abuse.

My bill would, as I said earlier, continue permanently the current sharing arrangement of 75 percent Federal/25 percent local. On Friday, in Louisville, my hometown and district, I had a meeting with a group called AWARE, an acronym for Area-Wide Alcohol/Drugs Rehabilitation Education Enforcement Coalition, which has been extremely successful at home. At that meeting, I indicated that I had, the day earlier, filed a bill. They were extremely gratified by that news because they picked a time at that meeting to advise me of the specific ways in which their ability to fight the war against drugs would be curtailed or maybe even eliminated unless the 75 percent/25 percent split or share is continued.

These are the people, as I said in my remarks to them on Friday, who are in the trenches. They are, literally, in the trenches fighting that way, which is so absolutely necessary to win if our streets are to be livable and our cities are to be livable again. My friends at home indicated to me that they wish to continue the effort. They believe the war is winnable, despite its very strong difficulties and very strong challenges which lie ahead. But, the only way they can win that war, Mr. Speaker, as they have advised me clearly, is with adequate resources.

When my bill is printed, I intend to circulate in the form of a Dear Colleague letter to all of my colleagues, some information about it. My letter will indicate that my colleague, friend, and congressional classmate, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], who is the chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, which I happen to serve on with him, is a colleague of mine in these efforts to create a continuation of the 75/25 percent sharing arrangement. I will ask my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and me in these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this moment to tell our colleagues that the war against drugs is a very stern challenge for all Members. This is a challenge that we can meet and surmount. However, it will take resources, Federal and local. It is my belief that if we retain the current arrangement of 75 percent/25 percent local, we have a better chance of meeting that challenge.

RESOLUTION REPEALING 25TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today as I have for 25 years, I have reintroduced a resolution asking for the repeal of the 25th amendment to the Constitution, which is in respect to Presidential succession.

The reason I do so is that I was here at the time in 1965, and in fact I think it was this month or thereabouts, when this resolution was brought up quite suddenly. In that day and time, Members did not have the procedural methods that we are accustomed to today. They were, in a manner of speaking, more direct, and in fact pretty much on the fast track.

Appropriation bills for defense, which for that day and time were astoundingly high, \$35 billion, would go through this Chamber in less than 20 minutes. Tax bills would come under closed rule, and they still do, and some of the more complicated tariff arrangements in the tax bills would flash through here with little or no debate, and certainly no amendments.

When this amendment came up, and the bells, which were infrequently rung in that day and time, called for a quorum, a live quorum, and then the offering of the resolution by then chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Manny Celler, I naturally was intrigued. I came forward, and not being a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I got a copy of the resolution. I read it, reread it, and could not imagine that it was serious.

Therefore, I went to the chairman and I asked him, "Chairman, what is this about? You are not really pushing this?" At that time, Chairman Celler was up in years and not feeling too well. He was kind of crotchety and ill-tempered, and was very impatient with me. He said, "Well, I don't know what you are asking." I said, "You refer here to, if the majority of the governing body decides that the President is disabled; that is, unable to discharge his duties, they shall then declare so, and the Vice President becomes interim or acting President." I said, "Now, what do you mean by 'governing body'?" There is no such language in this Constitution." He got very impatient and said, "Well, I don't have time. You ought to know that that refers to the Cabinet."

□ 1220

And I said, "Well, but the Cabinet is not a constitutional word, either."

Well, with that he lost patience with me and kind of cursed me under his breath and waved me away.

So I came back and sat and looked it over, and the more I read it, the more

I became convinced that a real effort was being made that afternoon to pass that bill, and I would not support it.

So I found myself one of about 28 voting no, but I was the only one who took the floor, like today on a special order right after, and spoke out and gave my reasons. I wish I had been altogether wrong. It is difficult to evoke 1965 today.

The big ado was the fact that President Johnson had been President without a Vice President for 1 year, and I brought out the fact, not to Chairman Celler, but to the author of the resolution in the Senate, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana. I was very, very concerned. I did not think that three-fourths of the legislatures would without inspection and thorough going review of the history would quickly approve that resolution. Well, I was wrong. They did. It was in post-haste, a minimum amount of time, approved by the required number of State legislatures. The rest is history.

I said that what this did was promote and provide the environment, in the words of James Madison, for "the bold and the ambitious to take over."

I pointed to the experience of such men in our history back in the beginnings when we had such men and had some, like Aaron Burr, who were even conspiring with the Spanish down in the Southwest to form some kind of allegiance actually against the United States, and who as you will recall your history was the one who in a duel killed Alexander Hamilton. He was certainly within that definition of James Madison, bold and ambitious.

I said in those remarks that we could not do anything less than appeal to the future at such times, which God forbid but which experience showed we had suffered then, such as the Civil War, times of divisiveness, times of passion, that the bold and the ambitious would be fishing for power and that this instrumentality would hang like Damocles' sword over our constitutional and democratic government's head forever and a day until it is repealed.

Well, I never foresaw that in my lifetime or even in my membership in the Congress I would see that happen, but it did.

I want the RECORD to show that in 1974 by the time we had the incident of Vice President Spiro Agnew that had faded, just 1 year before in September of 1973, who recalls Vice President Spiro?

Well, to our detriment, all free people in all the history of free people in a democracy, history shows that when people relax their hold on their responsibilities and their duties, they would lose their liberties and lose that democracy, as indeed history shows they have, and as we are now, and a long way down the road with apparently very little perception on the part of those who would have the responsibility

of molding opinion or leadership for which the people must depend, but in our system it is presupposed that that knowledge is inherent in the people, which I think everybody knows is an assumption that in these difficult days and in the days of instantaneous electronic communication and the grasp for power and the exercise for power, notwithstanding the constitutional restraints, is something that the people have to depend on their agents, that is us; but today we live in a day and time whether it is in private enterprise or public, the sense of trusteeship is not there.

We see the dilemma that we are in now and probably the most serious one confronting this Nation in I would say a 100 years, not 75 years, with very little perception even in the industry itself known as the banking and financial enterprises.

You see where corporate heads even at a time when their competitiveness is nil and still holding that power and those inordinate profits, will look upon their enterprise which has quasi-public responsibilities as something that has no trust responsibility. Inherent in that and the compromise of integrity is the basic root from which these very difficult problems which in due time will be called crises; but at the bottom of it is a constellation, an array of constitutional enactments, such as the 25th amendment, and what follows there from the executive branch's powers and the Executive orders that have emanated from various Presidencies, the delegation of tremendous authority during times of crisis, such as war, from the Congress under the Constitution to the President as would be necessary during those times. A multimember body cannot exercise with the rapidity and quickness of judgment and decision that a unitary official, like the President must, in time of war; so if we look at the powers the President exercises today that obviously have to be delegated by the Congress under the Constitution, they date back to the Espionage Act of 1970.

Unfortunately, democracies, and I think ours in particular, have fallen right into the faults of the monarchies. Therefore, we are like the old Bourdon kings. We learn nothing and we forget nothing.

The 25th amendment is a dangerous sword hanging over our heads. I never dreamed in my lifetime as much and as troubled as I was by the occurrence in September 1973, by the departure of Spiro Agnew as Vice President and the circumstances, and that is another story, and apparently according to him in the book he wrote afterward, and the title of that book is "Go Quietly Or Else," and he attributes that threat to then Gen. Alexander Haig, who 1 year later joined Senator Bayh and Henry Kissinger, approached President Nixon as the House of Representatives was on

the verge of voting an impeachment resolution and said, "If you don't quit, we will invoke the 25th amendment."

Now, I cannot see any of us, and particularly since I was here at the time and was a lone voice who recorded why I had voted no, the other 27 Members voted no, but as far as I know, never stated any reason. I did, and ever since then it has been at the bottom of a great deal of concern; so today I have reintroduced this and it is now known as House Joint Resolution 310.

I am reaffirming a conviction I have had for 25 years, as I say and repeat, and I believe that strongly today as ever that the 25th amendment is a threat to the stability of elected Government in this country. We value our Constitution because it ensures that the Government is elected and that the elected Government is bound by laws.

□ 1230

But laws and constitutions are only as strong as the will of the people that keep and enforce them. A government respects law only if its leadership is committed to law. And we know that this is not always the case. In the 25th amendment we have a device that is intended to provide for an orderly succession in the office of the Presidency. Proponents of the amendment had the best of intentions, I have no doubt of that. But to conceive and write the legislation that was going to truly carry out those intentions was, and has turned out to be, something else. The result is that we have a standing invitation in law in the Constitution to overthrow the President through the operation of the disability clause of the 25th amendment. In recent weeks we have learned of our current President's health problems, problems which are being treated and which are still being studied by medical officials—and, God willing, will result in complete, total recovery for our President. But none of us, no one, has any guarantees to life, and there is no way of knowing whether the 25th amendment will become applicable during this administration or any other administration.

However, Presidential succession has been an issue in nearly every Presidency since Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson suffered a stroke and had a 2-year disability while in office. Then Roosevelt's death, Eisenhower's heart attack, Kennedy's assassination, Nixon's resignation, and Reagan's near-assassination and later cancer surgery.

Mr. Speaker, I have voted in recent days in ways that clearly show I am in the minority on some issues, and this has been true all through my career. It was not because the positions were taken because I loved them; I am like everybody else, I love a winner too. But since I started on the city council, I cut my teeth in politics there, never having intended to get into politics, I realized that one had to base whatever

decisions he made on as much knowledge and documentation and without fear of favor as it was humanly possible to summon. And if the people give you that independence, who else, then, can be the cause for the deprivation of it other than one's self?

So, as I say and repeat, clearly I have been in the minority. On the city council, on June 19, 1954, of all days, I was the only one voting against an array of segregatory ordinances, for my great city of San Antonio had never bothered to pass since it was founded as a municipality under our law in 1839. And it looked very, very extraordinary that I would vote "no" and eight members would vote "aye." But I did. I had the great pleasure in exactly 1 year and 10 months later, with a new council, of offering the repealer and opening every tax support and municipal facility to all citizens regardless of race, color, creed, sex, or religious behavior.

I have introduced legislation in an attempt to repeal the 25th amendment ever since it was ratified in 1966-67.

Now, who bothers with the 25th amendment? Who even reads it?

I want to ask my colleagues, "How many of you are familiar with its exact wording?" And who is going to tell me, when I took the floor in August 1965 and was the only one giving reasons for voting "no" to that resolution, that I would see the worst fears confirmed in my lifetime? I never dreamed of the extraordinary dangers inherent in that amendment.

What is this 25th amendment? Among other things, it was passed because apparently it was felt that a great crisis had ensued after the death of President Kennedy and the assumption of the Presidency by Vice President Johnson. Now, Johnson, because he did not have a Vice President for 1 year—and I remonstrated with Senator Bayh and with Chairman Celler that the ship of state survived, it survived the assassination of Lincoln and the attempted impeachment and trial for impeachment of President Johnson, who succeeded him. Now, who was Andrew Johnson's Vice President? I said, "Let's not hurry."

What was overlooked was something, which I researched: The Congress in its very first Congress passed enabling legislation to carry out that section in the Constitution with respect to the Presidency and its occupancy. And what those statutes said—and they lasted until 1925—was that if anything happened to our President, if he should die while in office or resign or probably impeached—which was remote, of course, because in 1791 nobody thought of that—but they were serious people and they were following through implementing the statutes in those areas of general direction in the Constitution.

What they provided for was that if that President was to leave office and there remained 1½ years or more in his

term, an election should be held so that the people would elect their President. The last thing the men who wrote the Constitution ever wanted and feared the most was an unelected chief magistrate, as they called him in that day and time, or President. And we got him.

There is a fairly good book on this, entitled "The Process of Political Succession," though not about what I have just said. I have not seen it written anywhere. It is edited by Peter Calvert.

The orderly transition on the assassination of John Kennedy was not, in fact, as orderly as it was made out to seem to be to the outside world. But compared with the chaos that followed the attempted assassination of Ronald Reagan in 1981—and, I might add, what followed his cancer surgery in 1985—it was a model. And of course what happened in between with President Nixon in 1974 was just as chaotic.

Now, if the 25th amendment was meant to eliminate chaos and provide for a smoother transition, this has not been accomplished. We are just lucky.

What happened in 1974? We had the Chief of Staff Alexander Haig and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, both positions filled by appointment, not elected by the people, saying, "Mr. President, if you do not resign, we may have to invoke the 25th amendment." These two unelected officials were going to use the disability clause of the 25th amendment to make a decision for the American people, make that decision for them and force the President out of office.

Later, upon the attempted assassination of President Reagan in 1981, the self-same Alexander Haig, as Secretary of State this time, was then at the scene claiming to be in charge of the country when in fact there were three men ahead of him in the line of Presidential succession.

Such ambition and such ignorance of our Constitution and the 1947 Presidential Succession Act is precisely the danger inherent in the disability clause of the 25th amendment.

In 1985 President Reagan's cancer surgery caused another crisis in possible Presidential succession. The President's reluctance to turn over the reins of power under the 25th amendment during his recuperation period may have caused one of the worst scandals in recent history, the Iran-Contra affair. In fact, when President Reagan went in for the actual surgery, he did not want to set a precedent and bind the hands of his successor, so although he wrote a letter that followed the format of the 25th amendment, it did not call what he was doing an action under the 25th amendment and in fact said that he did not think the 25th amendment applied to his temporary sedation for surgery.

□ 1240

But what about his recuperation? A person does not have major surgery and go back to work at full force as soon as the anesthesia wears off, yet I have read that the President's legal counsel, Fred Fielding, together with Chief of Staff Donald Regan, made the decision for the President to resume the Office of the Presidency immediately after his surgery. Not the doctors, not the Cabinet, but two Presidential advisers made the decision. When asked about this, Mr. Fielding said that his and Regan's decision was based on the surgeon's saying that the President was OK. They reportedly accepted this on face value and did not question the physician about the President's judgment.

It was a terrible thing for the President to be brought back to office that soon, a terrible thing for the country, reports that President Reagan made Presidential decisions during his recovery from cancer surgery. It lends additional credence to the former National Security Adviser, Mr. McFarlane's, contention that he received all approval from Reagan for the arms shipment to Iran. Reagan underwent surgery on July 13. The first arms shipment occurred the next month.

Was the President reluctant to invoke the 25th amendment because of its disability provisions because of the probability that he could not regain power once he regained his health? Mr. Speaker, the 25th amendment certainly did not help prevent that tragic mistake in his judgment, and it possibly caused it because of the fear that power, once relinquished, could not be regained. As reported from a book based on Presidential disability and the 25th amendment, edited by Kent W. Thompson, one of the drafters of the amendment, former Senator Birch Bayh, has stated there was concern about the possibility that a means for a coup d'etat was being created by the language of the amendment. He has said that this concern led to the inclusion of the President's Cabinet in the decisionmaking of the President's inability to discharge the duties of his office.

But here I must interject the very question I raised with Chairman Celler. "Cabinet" is not a constitutional word. "Governing body" is not a constitutional word. So, even if Birch Bayh felt that they were invoking the Cabinet, it was certainly a very, very naive assumption. But the 25th amendment does not even mention the President's Cabinet, as I said. What it states is this:

Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, and up to now the Congress has provided no law, determine that the President is unable to discharge

the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as acting President.

Now, in fact in light of the additional fact that the amendment was drafted in response to the assassination of President Kennedy, it is significant that Senator Robert Kennedy expressed grave concern about this provision of the amendment. Senator Bayh has reported that Senator Kennedy objected to the language and told Senator Bayh that President Kennedy did not know any of the members of his Cabinet personally, until he appointed them. Senator Kennedy believed that the Cabinet then was not close to the President and could not possibly offer the kind of protection against a coup that Bayh and the other drafters of the amendment thought they were providing, and I certainly do agree. You cannot give those with the most to gain from a decision the nearly absolute power to make that decision and not to expect it to be abused at some point.

Compounding the inherent danger caused by the disability clause or the technical problems; for instance, what constitutes an inability to discharge the duties of the Presidency, is this limited to medical disability, or does it include political inability to lead a country? In time of stress, and passion, and division, why not? Why could the judgment not be that the President was totally and politically unable to lead the country? The Constitution does not say that cannot be. What is the duty of the President's physician if he uncovers a serious illness which the President wishes to keep confidential? What happens to the physician-patient privilege against revealing such information? Further, if inability includes being put under anesthesia, as many believe, despite President Reagan's assertions to the contrary, does it also include being under the influence of sleeping pills? How about inebriation or even changes of mood caused by prescription medication?

With so much left to the interpretation by those who are charged with the responsibility and power of making a determination of the President's ability to discourage his duties, there is much room left for mischief, and what is the incentive that would lead the Vice President and members of the President's Cabinet to move for their own purposes under the disability clause of the 25th amendment? Look at what we have had lately, since 1945, but much more so in the last decade. We have seen a rise of the imperial Presidency in this country. I dare say that perhaps the overwhelming majority of the Members in and out of Congress, as well as a citizen, would say, if asked, that the President has more power, that he is omniscient, and that he is of greater power and authority than either of the other one of the two

branches of Government. That simply is not so, and it is in direct contradiction to our U.S. Constitution, yet our Presidents have been approaching a position of absolute authority, with greater momentum every day, and going back for some time and on a bipartisan basis.

I have been raising these issues since I came to the Congress. Look at the recent vote by Congress to give the President absolute authority to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico or 160 other countries, and look at the recent votes ratifying the President's unilateral warmaking. I was one of only three, as far as I know, that criticized the Presidential order giving rise to the invasion of Panama on December 20, 1989. Where are they now? We are in occupation and governing militarily. We have over 15,000 of our troops in Panama. They are in charge and governing. That is two-thirds, more than two-thirds, than the top number we had at the time of the invasion.

So, who cares? But what does it mean? It means that Presidents, if wise, would want to have a copartnership of the policymaking body, or at least the leadership known as the Congress. Congress, a multiple body, particularly under the circumstances surrounding today, is quite unable or unwilling to rise to the occasion, and it has been for some time. But not too many years ago, take the first peacetime draft act, 1940. Congress can sure be a lot more responsive to their constituents' well-being. Yes, with great debate and hesitation they passed that first peacetime draft in 1940, but they unsanctioned because they would last no more than a year, but they also provided protection for the individual that might be called who would lose his job, even if temporarily.

□ 1250

So right then and there, it provided certain protections. One year later in 1941, the month of August, it came up for renewal. The Congress was not going to extend it, even then, because they realized what a far-reaching power they had given the President.

Then after much debate and one amendment by a Member of this House that said, "OK, if we extend it, it will have this proviso, that no person subject to the terms of this act shall be compelled to serve against his will outside of the continental United States, unless a declaration of war is expressly provided so by the Congress."

With that inclusion, they got the one vote that extended that bill, passed the bill, passed by one vote in the late summer of 1941, just a few months before Pearl Harbor.

What we have forgotten is that the declaration of war did come on December 8. Then when the hot shooting phase of the war ended in Europe, sub-

sequently in Japan, we forgot all about that and we kept a draft apparatus. But then I recall vividly, as if it were today, get the boys back, we have won the war, not realizing that and even today we are still under the misperception that that war is over with. Actually, we still have not too many thousand, under 300,000 troops in Germany, which sooner or later the Germans are not going to tolerate, as they are beginning not to.

Is there a peace treaty? Well, the nearest thing was the agreements that had been lately signed by Russia and the other countries on the merging of the two Germanies. But there never has been a formal peace treaty or conference terminating World War II.

In Korea, South Korea, we have about 48,000 troops and another 40,000 Americans. We have no treaty obligation for the defense of South Korea. Our meager handful of troops could hardly be sufficient to protect South Korea. The South Korean defense is greater than most of our NATO allies' defense forces, better equipped, with the most sophisticated warcraft, soldiers highly trained, and they have an army of over 65,000.

So what is the military purpose of 48,000 American military in South Korea? We have already had, just in the last 2 years, four violent demonstrations against our presence militarily there. But we are still—we are still appropriating a couple of billion dollars. What is the military purpose? Where is the leadership of the country in the executive branch, the President being the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States?

Just the day before yesterday I saw where he is considered the Commander in Chief of the United States. That is simply not so. He is not the Commander in Chief of the United States. If he is, then we have a king. And if so, our citizens are not citizens. They are subjects. We are not citizens, we are subjects.

It is that simple, and it goes back to the fact that without any perception, we have gravitated from one situation to another without addressing the basic constitutional issue, such as the Draft Act.

Now, the President has the power, and in fact right now we have about 17½ million names of the young that have to register for the draft, 18 to 20. Our Government can in 3 hours time bring in the first call. They have got everything set up. They have even got a rental arrangement with a building downtown, and it would not take just a matter of hours. It is all set up.

Of course, the Congress has to sanction, but we do not have to pass any law or anything. We just have to sanction the President's power to carry out the draft provisions of the Draft Act. So where are we?

It took the bitter divisiveness first beginning to show its ugly head in the

Korean war. There at the end of 1953, before the armistice, whatever you want to call it, we were beginning to have the same kind of demonstrations. They had protesters in California stopping munitions trains and all, but by that time President Eisenhower got elected and he brought about the arrangements of the truce. So it did not give rise, but at the basis of that was the fact that people were being selected on a very selective basis, militating against the poor and the uneducated, to go out and die and face death while other Americans were not.

This is a tremendous transaction from World War II and the carrying out of the draft there. So I am just giving this as an example of how things can add up to an aggravated situation in a time of great passion and divisiveness that could make this amendment the most dangerous weapon we have directed at the heart of a democracy.

In our Nation's first 10 years of nationhood, which really were the First and Second Continental Congresses, the Articles of Confederation, nobody thought of having the office of the Presidency anywhere around. They feared that. The whole debate in the Constitutional Convention later in 1787 clearly reflected that all through, and certainly an unelected President, that was the worst thing they could conceive happen to our country. So they did not bother, the first 10 years of our nationhood, they did not bother having an office anything like that, no such thing as a President or a Chief Magistrate, as they called them then.

They did not want to have anything to do with that from which they were extricating themselves, tyrannical, arbitrary, capricious power. This is why the most revolutionary words ever to this day are the first words of the Preamble to our Constitution, and I have encouraged, all through my activity for years and years, students to memorize them.

I will go to elementary school students, and I will offer some little reward like a book or something to those students that memorize. Why? Because encased in those words are still the most revolutionary, that is, "We the people of the United States," not the Congress, not the President, not anybody else, but "We the people of the United States" are the source of all power in order to form a more perfect union, et cetera, et cetera. The people.

How many countries in the 20th century that have started out in the name of the people would say that that power emanated from the people? They would not even refer to it. Those were extremely radical words in a world where the whole world was governed either by kings, by divine right, or by czars or potentates or allegorics. And here there are Americans saying no, power does not come to a king from

God. Power comes only from the people.

Well, look at what is happening today. One would not think so. One would think that we were supposed to be responsible to some leader, not to the people.

□ 1300

For the first time in this world, as I said, then of kings, and today of the other system, those words came across. We have strayed away from that, so that when we end up with the possibility, in fact, the reality, that we have an unelected President and an unelected Vice President, we have a continuing sword pointed at the very heart of our democratic, constitutional form of government.

As the President gains greater and more absolute power, it is increasingly important for us to reevaluate the 25th amendment. The incentives for blind ambition to govern actions under the disability clause of the 25th amendment are stronger now than ever before. We must not allow provisions for a coup d'etat, which the disability clause establishes, to remain a part of our law.

As a nation established on the principle of the power of the people, we have provided through the 25th amendment a means of relinquishing that power and establishing it instead in a very few unelected government officials.

How can we allow this kind of Presidential power, which our Founding Fathers feared and tried to prevent, but which has grown out of any sense of proportion in recent years, to be held by an unelected President who has assumed power over the wishes of the elected President?

The 25th amendment allows this, and it is wrong. It is dangerous, and the 25th amendment should be repealed.

LEADING EMPLOYERS INTO APPRENTICE PARTNERSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time today to discuss with the membership a bill that has been introduced recently, which I had the privilege to introduce with five Republicans and five Democrats, H.R. 2550, the acronym of which is LEAP [Leading Employers into Apprentice Partnerships].

The purpose of this special order today, Mr. Speaker, is to really have a kind of electronic "Dear Colleague" with those Members who have not become familiar with this piece of legislation.

To put it in the proper context, let me begin by reading from "America, 2000." Those Members that are not aware of "America, 2000" should know

that this is essentially the President's blueprint for educational reform for this country. This is the document that the President and Secretary Alexander and our Nation's Governors and various business leaders have crafted to kind of pave the way for educational reform, and in some cases, radical reform, for this country.

I am not going to be dealing directly with the main thrust of this book, which is elementary reform and secondary reform. I want to turn to page 69 of this document and read from what they call the after-school years. Because it is my contention, and one of the reasons that I introduce this legislation, that we have not paid enough attention as a society and as a government to those people that find themselves after school without any opportunities whatsoever.

That is directly related to the fact that while they were in school they did not get the education, the basic skills that they needed, to put themselves into the work force and become skilled laborers.

But let me read some paragraphs from this, because it basically sets forward our strategy, supposedly, as government, to these individuals who have not been well-treated by our present public education system.

Comprehensive, well-integrated, lifelong learning opportunities must be created for a world in which three of four new jobs will require more than a high school education. Workers with only high school diplomas may face the prospect of declining incomes, and most workers will change their jobs 10 or 11 times over a lifetime.

In most States the present system for delivering adult literacy services is fractured and inadequate. Because the United States has far higher rates of adult functional illiteracy than other advanced countries, a first step is to establish in each State a public-private partnership to create a functionally literate work force.

In some other countries, government policies and work programs are carefully coordinated with private sector activities to create effective apprenticeship and job training activities. By contrast, the United States has a multilayered system of vocational and technical schools, community colleges, and specific training programs funded from multiple source and subject to little coordination. These institutions need to be restructured so that they fit together more sensibly and effectively to give all adults access to flexible and comprehensive programs that meet their needs. Every major business must work to provide appropriate training and education opportunities to prepare employees for the twenty-first century.

Finally, a large share of our population, especially those from working class, poor, and minority backgrounds, must be helped to attend and remain in college. The cost of a college education as a percentage of median family income has approximately tripled in a generation. That means more loans, scholarships, and work-study opportunities are needed.

I chose to begin my remarks with that quote, Mr. Speaker, because I want to talk about the disparity be-

tween word and deed, the difference between what we are preaching and what we are practicing, in Congress and, indeed, as a Government at large.

It is not a question, when we talk about education, whether we are talking about afterschool or preschool education, of how much money we spend. It is a question of how do we spend the money that we have?

With that in mind, having just read several paragraphs of governmental intent, let me talk about the practical effect of how our educational dollars are going for those people that are coming out of high school and looking for work opportunities.

Let me refer to this first chart and talk about three, I think, very important points that show the difference between word and deed in our educational policy.

First, about 66 percent of our Federal education dollars are spent on 30 percent of the high school students who are college bound. In other words, 70 percent of those students that get out of high school, or do not finish high school, are without any real major means of funding.

What does that necessarily translate to? That means under our present system, a college bound student in this country can expect to get about \$5,000 per year in combined subsidies. A noncollege bound student, what we will now call and probably call for years to come the nontraditional student, can probably expect an average of \$50, one one-hundredth of what our college bound population can expect. If this nontraditional student ends up in jail, he or she gets a nice big subsidy, but that is hardly the point. The point is how do we keep that eventuality from happening?

Look at the difference between what we are doing in this country and what our competitors around the world are doing in terms of putting their commitment into moving a trained, and in many cases highly developed skill force, into the front lines of competition.

U.S. competitors spend an average of 4 to 6 percent of their payroll on worker training, while U.S. business spends less than 1½ percent. Of this 1½ percent spent on worker training, 66 percent is invested in the already college-educated employees.

In other words, if you are in the work force, if you have a college degree, your employer probably will spend more money making sure that you get an advanced degree, increased training, than he will on the bottom rung, or the front line worker who, in many cases, probably is more deserving and more desperate to receive that training.

We have a shrinking work pool in this country. Any demographic study will tell you that, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics down to just about any Member of this body. But very

often when we talk about Government policy and when we talk about competitiveness, we mention the word "capital" and we talk about capital formation, we talk about plants and equipment, and research and development for which we are currently proposing a 20-percent tax credit, or we talk about cash, access to funds.

What we very infrequently talk about when we talk about capital and competition in this country is human capital, our workers, our labor force, and how we are going to proceed to prepare them, and in so doing, us, for the 21st century.

Now, as anyone within the sound of my voice knows, we are in the middle of a recession right now, perhaps bottoming out, perhaps not.

□ 1310

The point is that when the economy was going full tilt, many employers were basically grasping at any workers they could find. They were giving what is now called the steamed mirror test. In terms of employment, that means if you can walk up to a mirror, exhale, and the mirror steams, you have got the job.

But the workers we are talking about for the 21st century have to be trained with both advanced and basic skills. A work force without advanced skills cannot compete with our developed trading partners, a work force without basic skills cannot compete with developing countries.

While we talk about what we are going to do to become more competitive with Japan and Germany, we really are falling behind some of the countries that we are providing aid to, because we are not investing enough of our time, talent, and our attention into this work force of nontraditional students.

Let me go a step further and say that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have now sat through 2 or 3 weeks of hearings on competitiveness. We are having an exhaustive review of how this Nation can become more competitive, and everybody from the Speaker of the House down to business executives and union leaders have come in and said that what we need to do is recommit to education. There is no argument with that. Everybody believes in that. Sure, we will quibble over how much money to spend and how the money should be spent, but everybody believes that a competitive America has to be a highly educated America.

There has been some discussion during these competitiveness hearings of trying to create work-study or apprentice programs or the work-study opportunities fleetingly referred to in this document that I read earlier, but very little legislative attempt to kind of plant that seed and create a mechanism by which business and govern-

ment and communities and professional educators can actually plant and harvest our human capital and prepare for the 21st century.

Quite honestly, some of the most compelling testimony I have heard has come from business, and specifically the words of William Kolberg, who is the president of the National Alliance of Business, who was a witness at the Ways and Means hearings on international competitiveness said this in his speech a few months ago, he said:

The last frontier of international competitiveness, I submit, is the work force. It is the one component we can't export or import with ease and quantity. Those nations that build the best educated and trained workers into internationally competitive skill forces will draw the high-skill industries and, thus, enjoy the higher standards of living. Those nations that have undereducated and undertrained workers will increasingly be forced to compete on the basis of low wages and, thus, suffer lower standards of living.

That is significant in this Congress, because one of the major pieces of legislation we have thus far passed is the North American Free-Trade Agreement, our free-trade agreement with Mexico. One of the major arguments levied against support for that trade negotiation was that by grafting onto American capital a country that is rich in human resources but very poor in development such as Mexico, we would basically just wind up exporting cheap labor and cheap-labor jobs to Mexico.

Well, those of us that supported the North American Free-Trade Agreement believed that what we really had the opportunity to do was raise the standard of living in Mexico, raise the wage base, raise the opportunity, and in so doing, probably create more higher paid jobs. But if we do not begin to invest in our workers in this country, the fears of the opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement will probably become a reality.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, for all of the lofty comments being made by businesses about how important their work force is, we are still way behind our foreign competitors. Coincidentally, America and Germany right now, in terms of public funds, are spending about the same on their public education systems, about \$300 billion annually, and that includes Federal, State, and local subsidies.

But the difference, of course, is then what is happening with business and through business.

Where do we go from here? In the competitiveness hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means, we heard testimony from a great number of witnesses, and most witnesses testified on such things as research and development tax credits, and, again, when I am talking about that, I am talking about bricks and mortar, plant and equipment, and various allocation formulas for multinational corporations and the high cost of capital. A

few witnesses testified on the training programs their agencies, business, or industries are undertaking.

In order to improve this Nation's human capital, and there are some outstanding leaders, Mr. Speaker, that are doing this, Motorola, Corning Glass, American Express have all kind of created career academies and work reorganization and work training and apprenticeship programs which really, I think, are the best that we have to offer in the business community. But there is a demand for American business to play a larger role in making that transition from the work force to the skill force.

Right now big businesses can afford to undertake education programs. Why? Because they can see the macroeconomic effect of their investments. They can afford the cash flow of education programs. They can devote a number of personnel without severely impinging upon their productivity. That is wonderful.

But what about small business? What about most of the businesses in this country, most the businesses that create most of the jobs in this country?

Right now only about 13 percent of the small firms in this country offer any formal training to workers with less than a high school degree. And why? Well, because they cannot afford the investment. In many cases, if they do invest in some kind of worker training program, if they do actually try to expand their work force and specifically train workers and perhaps even better their education, what they invariably wind up doing is losing those trained workers to a larger firm. So obviously there is no cost-benefit relationship to that investment, because why train a worker, spend your money, for somebody else.

However, if small businesses can join together, they can see these effects just like a big business can. With that in mind, my colleagues and I have introduced Leading Employers into Apprentice Partnerships, or the LEAP Act.

Let me take a moment to describe this in detail, Mr. Speaker, because this may sound complicated, but, indeed, it is quite simple.

It is predicated on the belief that businesses and communities have a mutual interest in replenishing the skill force in their own communities, whether they are large or small, but unfortunately, right now, they do not have the mechanism by which to do it. The LEAP Act provides that mechanism.

Through the Tax Code, the LEAP Act would encourage businesses to get together and contribute funds into one pot, a 501(c) nonprofit tax-exempt organization that would fund apprenticeship programs in conjunction with local community schools and community colleges. This is not a top-down

educational reform that is handed down from the Secretary of Education to various State bureaucrats and back to the communities. It is a tax credit that goes to those businesses and those leaders in the community and allows them to form the model that they need to address the skill needs of their communities.

Notice in the chart here the need in the business community for skilled employees. That is probably true in every town and city in this country. Businesses provide money for a nonprofit organization and create guidelines for the apprentice program.

In this particular apprentice program, you would have not just business, although because they are obviously investing in this, they would probably have a majority of seats on the board of the tax-exempt nonprofit organization, but you would also have probably leaders from the educational system, whether or not we are talking about the high school or the community college or both, and you would no doubt have governmental leaders of the community, and you would probably also have the apprentices or perhaps their parents or both designing the apprentice program. It follows then that business and the school partnership establish the structure of the apprentice program, and by that, I mean a work-study opportunity.

Students would attend the apprenticeship programs at local businesses for school credit in addition to academic programs at school, and here is what you wind up getting: on the microeconomic level, the business is going to wind up with employees that are gaining basic skills as well as specialized skills.

□ 1320

They are reinvesting at a local level for a specific task. Community work forces reskilled and replenished with a minimal of oversight by business, or for that matter, by Government.

The tax-exempt organization is designing, implementing, and operating the program. The schools get an increase in class resources seeded by business, increase in class attendance, because what we have added here is purpose. The one thing perhaps missing in our educational system right now is a reason to stay in school. Students cannot understand why they should stay in school. They cannot understand what the connection is between what they are learning in a classroom and what they will need in life.

Finally, your graduation rate will go up. What happens on the macroeconomic level, unemployment probably goes down because we have more people not just getting skills, but getting a job with those skills. Federal assistance probably is decreased through unemployment insurance compensation, and welfare, public assistance

programs that are usually designed to help those people that have been thrown out of the workplace due to lack of skills.

We have an increase in funds devoted to education, with no increase in Federal bureaucracy. Speak to any teacher about that right now. Just about any teacher I deal with in my congressional district, Mr. Speaker, will profess to say they got into this profession under a false premise. They thought they would be allowed to teach. What they are doing now is filling out forms and going to meetings. Hopefully, this will be able to translate a little bit into their freedom to perform their job.

Increased productivity, increase in competitiveness. Let me dwell just for a moment again on the makeup of the board; 51 percent control of the local businesses. Do not forget this can be a consortium of businesses, and in most small towns would; 49 percent would be the community high school and college staff, if there is one in their community. Trainees or parents of trainees, State and local officials in this, such as mayors, State representatives and senators. If there is a secretary of education in the State or liaison from the Governor's office, so much the better. The purpose here is to bond business into the community for a common community goal. That is what is missing in our after school programs right now.

We have a lot of top-down funding for job skills. The Job Training Partnership Act, section 127 of the Tax Code is employer provided education. That helps. The targeted job tax credit helps.

Almost invariably, the hoops and hurdles people have to go through to qualify for these credits are dictated by an agency or bureaucracy, beyond the community's auspices. That is what this act seeks to reverse.

Now, basically, it would give schools new vocational opportunities while providing the resources to match. The reason this is important and timely right now is just like the Federal Government, which is going through obviously a period of contraction in trying to deal with their deficit, that is happening now in the State/local. My State of Iowa has a \$300 million deficit. There has been a cutback, of State-provided services, which has meant fewer agencies being open shorter hours. It is unlikely, then, we will see a lot of new education initiatives coming from our governmental organizations, because they do not have the money to fund them. However, because of tight Federal budgets, Congress cannot afford to pick up the whole cost. So we need a new player.

The obvious player in this particular scenario, Mr. Speaker, is business. Who, more than they, have a vested interest in replenishing our work skills? When I say "business" I do not mean to

imply that labor does not. Organized labor has traditionally been one of our greatest repositories of work skill training. This is designed to help them as much as the management side of the equation.

Now, how would this tax incentive work? The bill is a tax bill, amends no other existing language than the Internal Revenue Tax Code and provides dollar-for-dollar matching funds from the Federal Government. The first part of the incentive is the deduction.

Right now, business can receive a deduction for contributions to a tax-exempt organization. That is worth about 34 cents on the dollar, if a company is paying a 34-percent corporate tax rate. The second part of the incentive, the new part, really is the 20-percent tax credit. Business would receive a 20-percent tax worth roughly 20 cents on the dollar. Together, these incentives would equal roughly 50 cents on the dollar, dollar-for-dollar matching funds. Businesses would have to put their money up front in order to see the tax offsets from the Government, but what we have now is a real incentive for businesses, large and small, to seek out work opportunities and train for those opportunities, and in so doing, put some pressure on their local education establishments to increase the basic skills, so that their potential work force can get those jobs.

Now, the American work force that I have been talking about, whom this act is trying to help, to help into apprenticeships, is a very multicultural phenomena. As we know, it is not the 30 percent of kids that will go on to college, the ones that are already, to a large degree, subsidized. We are talking about high school students and high school dropouts. We are talking about community college students who are returning for education, after perhaps many years out of the educational mainstream. We are talking about displaced homemakers. We are talking about former prisoners and substance abusers. We are talking about immigrants, nontraditional workers, which a major news publication in this country has referred to as the "forgotten half." And we know it is considerably more than 50 percent.

Now, we cannot afford to forego these people. We do not have the luxury of hiring only college-educated individuals, and we cannot afford to have workers pass only the steamed mirror test in order to get a job.

Incidentally, I might say to this point, Mr. Speaker, one of the main cosponsors of this bill is the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], who represents Harlem. Now, his district and my district could not be further apart, probably, in terms of their ethnic balance. I come from northwest Iowa. It is a small town, predominantly rural congressional district. He comes from Harlem, a big-city multicultural district.

Ironically, we have a lot of the same problems, a lot of displaced workers, reduced opportunity, a lot of nontraditional students. Consequently, the needs in the urban area and the needs in the rural areas are melded under a program like this, because they are designed close to home.

With that in mind, I am hoping that Members from both urban and rural constituencies will look favorably on this kind of legislation, because studies show that a significant portion of our students will learn better, as I said earlier, if they have a purpose, if there is some kind of work force incentive tied to that. Vocational education is the way we will keep many of our noncollege-bound kids involved and interested in school.

Now let me go to an example, a concrete example, of how this would work. This would apply just about anywhere. We will say there are a group of florists, and I chose them because florists tend to be typical small businesses, few employees, but like so many employers, looking and not finding the skilled labor that they need.

Under the LEAP Act, a group of florists could get together and contribute funds into a LEAP organization, into a tax-exempt entity, in order to fund an apprenticeship in that field. The work skills learned might include floral arranging, might include account keeping, and basic business skills of taking customer orders and office etiquette. In exchange for the opportunities to get some work-based learning, the apprenticeship is required to take additional classes in science. We will say horticulture, perhaps botany, and perhaps a business class or two.

It is in these more advanced academic requirements that students may finally see the reason that good reading, writing, and arithmetic skills are necessary. Academic course work that may seem dull to a high school junior will take on a new appeal when there is a work-based learning component to accompany. At the same time, students are getting a basic academic education. They are getting vocational education inside the businesses for which they might one day work, and while the work on the florist shop might not lead to a career in that field, the classroom work and basic job skills learned will stay with the students for a lifetime. So in other words, if a group of florists in a medium-sized city decide to replenish work skills, they turn back the high school or perhaps community college and say, "We will pay for you to teach a few basic courses that we need for our industry, such as botany, horticulture, perhaps some business math, but we are depending on you to provide at least some basic educational skills to these students so that by the time they get to their advanced learning, they will have the basic fundamentals to cope with the new curriculum."

That puts some legitimate pressure on local educational systems to deliver the goods. It also goes back to that question of purpose, the administrators, the teachers, the PTA can turn back to the students and say, "Now you know why you are in school. Businesses in this community are providing an opportunity for you which you may or may not use, but at least right now it is better than standing in the unemployment line."

□ 1330

In so doing it provides some purpose. Now, just coincidentally, and somewhat ironically, the Secretary of Labor, Lynn Martin in today's Washington Post talks about "Teaching Tomorrow's Skills." She has recently received a report from the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. Let me read just one paragraph from her editorial in today's Washington Post:

When I visited Union apprenticeship programs, the value of contextual learning was driven home when many young people told me that they finally understood why learning basics such as math was important. They said, "It's needed for the job."

Hence this bill, Mr. Speaker, to provide purpose to an eroding educational system that is providing a lot of instruction and is very process oriented. It is not outcome oriented. We process a lot of people through the system. We give them degrees. We send them on their way and invariably they wind up coming back, diploma in hand, but with really no productivity to show for it. If we want to go to an outcomes-based educational system, if America 2000 is going to mean something, we have to build purpose all the way through the system. I do not think it is too much to say to a 16-year-old or a 26-year-old who has had a variety of educational opportunities, but nothing really to show for it, that now we are going to create that connection between your work and your study.

Many of the purposes of this legislation are not to create anything new, but to use the existing facilities and capabilities that we have. We make use of the existing bricks and mortar, whether we are talking about a high school or whether we are talking about a community college, and we are using teachers already on State payrolls.

There is nothing, of course, to keep a business from saying, well, we want some of our employees to teach these courses; but because they are creating this Board and using the available talent pool in their educational system, it stands to reason that they will use those people best capable to make an educational contribution.

It makes use of existing Job Training Partnership Act structures and local private industry councils.

Indeed, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee for 4 years, we

worked closely with private industrial councils when we were reauthorizing the Vocational Act, the Perkins Act.

This to a very large degree is a self-help variation from the Carl Perkins Act; but most importantly, it draws on the talent and resources of the local community. The staff of the tax-exempt organization would work on scheduling the apprentice's time, drafting specific workplace learning goals, and in cases where applicable handle payroll or transportation for the apprentices.

Unlike most Federal programs, Mr. Speaker, this one stops when it is not working anymore. If businesses find that for some reason the purpose has run afoul of the original intent, if the tax-exempt organization is not working out, they can scrap it and start over or re-form into another group—no existing Government infrastructure which eventually begins to feed on itself.

Now, briefly let me talk about one of the criticisms of this kind of a system that invariably comes up when you propose these kinds of educational tax credits.

What about abuse? What about the employer who uses this tax credit in a sense to not really further the skill force of the community, but really kind of views Federal dollars to improve the very limited skills of an already very professional work force?

Fortunately, the Internal Revenue Code already contains some very serious antiabuse roles for tax-exempt organizations. The LEAP Act creates a new form of section 501 tax-exempt organization that is permitted to carry out these apprentice programs.

There are two forms of tax-exempt entities: public charities and foundations or private charities. A public charity, such as the American Cancer Society, has broad public support and gives funds to a broad cross-section of the public. A foundation, on the other hand, sometimes called a private charity, and that would be something like the Ford Foundation, has a narrower funding source and gives to a relatively narrower cross-section of the public. Foundation tax report rules are much more stringent than those for public charities.

The Internal Revenue Code is written in such a way as to call a new tax-exempt corporation a foundation. Unless it notifies the IRS that it is not a foundation and receives a determination letter from the IRS, that it is in effect a public charity. The IRS, in other words, has to make that determination.

Technically, this is called defining the term in a negative way. Section 509 of the Code calls organizations "private foundations" unless the organization receives more than one-third of its funding from forces such as grants, gifts, or contributions.

The partnership organizations created in the LEAP Act must file a timely notice with the IRS in order to qualify for tax-exempt status and to determine whether they are public charities or foundations. Provided that a particular LEAP organization is relatively broad-based, the IRS would then provide the organization with a determination letter stating that it is a tax-exempt public charity and give it a tax-exempt number. So already there is a system of oversight and review that unscrupulous employers would have to deal with from the very beginning.

All section 501 organizations must file an IRS form 990-PF, which is an information return. In the last few years the IRS has announced that it would step up auditing 990-PF forms and private foundations must also file a form 4720 for certain transactions.

The auditing of LEAP organizations or even the threat of audit, along with the penalties for misdeeds, should be enough to keep these organizations honest and worthy of their tax-exempt status, we hope.

But still, is it not better to at least give an incentive back to the community, as opposed to imposing a mandate on that community? Unfortunately, very often, although that is not the intent of some of our job training programs in our employment services that we provide through the Department of Labor and other Federal bureaucracies back to the States, what happens is the regulations are such that they discourage people from seeking training.

One of the big problems that may be encountered with organizations, such as the one I have described, would be areas of investment income and failure to distribute income. These problems would be covered under the prohibited transaction section 503 of the Code. These prohibited transactions would be: No. 1, lending money without adequate security and reasonable rate of interest; No. 2, pay and compensation in excess of reasonable allowance for salaries for other compensation for personal services actually rendered, or making any part of its services available on a preferential basis to the creator of the organization if the person or corporation made a substantial contribution.

What that basically says is a law firm is not going to be able to set up a tax-exempt organization to take its already highly educated work force and teach them at taxpayer expense a new and subtle and complicated form of the law to expand their business. That is why we are not necessarily giving the money to the businesses; we are giving the money through the businesses to the tax-exempt organizations, and it is the board who will decide.

Now, if for some reason a community decides unscrupulously to manipulate this board in such a way, then yes, probably the Federal Government

would step in; but unlike any other kind of tax credit that I know, Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation, H.R. 2550, forces accountability because we are forcing businesses and communities to watch themselves, so the policing mechanism again is at the local level, because the purposes and goals are at the local level.

Now, I have introduced this legislation, as I said, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUGHTON], who is the former chairman of Corning Glass, and as I said, five Republicans and five Democrats.

I cannot tell this body right now how much this tax credit costs. The Joint Tax Committee is currently looking into what kind of revenue offsets might be needed, and unfortunately I cannot tell you at this time how expensive this bill is to America.

I can tell you that the 20-percent R&E tax credit will probably cost the economy about \$1.8 billion over the next 5 years.

I would only argue, is it not as important to invest in human capital in this country as it is to invest in bricks and mortar and technology?

I would also say that are there not some savings to be derived if a bill like this actually works and in so doing we find we are less dependent on things like the Job Training Partnership Act or the Targeted Jobs Credit, or various other mechanisms that we have built into our Tax Code and into our Federal oversight that is designed to help people who have already lost an opportunity?

This bill is designed to help the people before they lose the opportunity. And I would argue that although I cannot from a joint tax point of view numerically say this is a savings of tax dollars, in terms of the investment in public policy I would have to argue that a bill like LEAP probably redirects the money where we want it to help those people before they lose their sense of purpose.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was the purpose of this special order today. I would encourage Members who are interested in finding out more to contact my office. I really feel as though this is a direction, if this country is going to talk about competitiveness, we have to talk about something more than capital gains, tax credits for research and experimentation and various, what have become known as, business-oriented tax credits.

This is a business-oriented tax credit, but it is the business of education that this country has to begin investing in. Federal Government, State government, local government cannot afford to do it. We do not have the revenues, we do not have the desire to raise our taxes to provide the revenues; because of that, Mr. Speaker, business large and small cannot afford not to.

A HISTORIC MEETING WITH DR. EDWARD DEMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, as many people know, Dr. Deming is in many ways the founder of the quality movement, as the man who initially in the late 1940's and early 1950's educated the Japanese into the process of quality, and into creating a culture of quality, and he was brought into the Capitol today. He is now in his early nineties. He spoke with a number of Members of Congress and senior staff people and members of the executive branch from the White House who came up to sit in and talk with him and learn about ways in which America has to change.

I want to particularly thank Speaker FOLEY and Republican leader BOB MICHEL for helping us with this particular project, getting Dr. Deming up here.

The thing I want to share with my colleagues is that Dr. Deming talks about a transformation, he talks about a change which he says is the same as taking ice and turning it into water. He says that if you are really going to compete in the 21st century, if you really want to have quality as it applies to health, to education, to manufacturing, to Government, it is not just reshaping what we already do, it is not just taking a block of ice and making it look different by making an ice sculpture. It is in fact a fundamental change, a transformation from the way we have been in the habit of thinking and doing things to a very different way. He uses the analogy of ice to water, the notion that you have to apply heat. He makes this point, in part, because he says that the greatest single problem has been good intentions, the people with the best of intentions and the best efforts; that people, as he puts it, who do not have basic knowledge, and he referred over and over this morning to the concept that you have to have profound knowledge and that profound knowledge comes from a really deep study of what leads to quality.

And the first step in leading to quality is the concept of the system, the idea that people are a team, that they are involved with each other in achieving things and that they have to learn to rely on each other in a cooperative way in order to get things done.

He made what I thought was an absolutely fascinating point about the difference between the pyramid in which we normally talk about hierarchies and a flowchart. He said that in the pyramid it may tell you who is in charge at the very top of the pyramid but it does not tell you what anybody is doing, it does not tell you what their real rela-

tionships are. He said that "in a flowchart I begin to understand what my job is, how it relates to jobs before me and how it relates to jobs after me, and I begin to understand why I am part of a larger system and myself. And I begin to find why my work has purpose." He drew the analogy of having to wash down a table. He said, "Now, am I cleaning this table off so you can use it as an office; am I cleaning the table off so you can use it in a restaurant; or am I cleaning it off so that it is an operating-room table?" He said there is a whole different standard of cleanliness for each of those three functions, a different kind of purpose. I am relating to different kinds of people. Am I relating to a secretary or to a surgeon as I design my job? And I think the point he is making is that if you start by thinking about the entire team, the team's function, the way the team works, you have a very different approach to getting the job done and a very different approach, if you will, to playing the game or to learning that if you approach it only from the standpoint of a hierarchy.

The other insight he offered was the distinction between games, we have winners and losers, and the rest of life. He made the point that, in learning, everybody can win, in learning, everybody can achieve a set standard, that you do not have to have a top 1 percent or a top 5 percent or a top 20 percent; that in fact if your goal is for everybody to learn how to read, it is possible to have a society in which for all practical purposes every person learns how to read. It is possible in a society in which every person learns how to do basic math. And that the difference between starting by grading people very early and telling them, "Well, you are really in the bottom 10 percent," leads a lot of them simply to drop out; it creates a sense of internalized distinction that leads people to be crippled and to feel psychologically humiliated and ultimately to be no longer participants.

Dr. Deming emphasized over and over the notion that you want to set standards that everybody reaches and you want to bring everybody along to that fulfillment. That you want everybody to have a chance to learn and everybody to have a chance to succeed and everybody to have a chance to be productive. In that way, the entire team is better off.

I found it a fascinating experience to deal with a man who participated in the studies at the Western Electric Hawthorne plant back in the mid-1920's, a man who helped develop our entire approach to the postwar world and who, by his work on General MacArthur's staff in 1947, had an initial introduction to Japan, a man who developed a general approach to thinking about systems, to thinking about variation, to thinking about dealing with human beings which allowed him to de-

velop what I believe is the most powerful model for working together in the information age, and which I think will be for the 21st century the same kind of breakthrough that the assembly line, Henry Ford and Taylor's scientific management were for the 20th century.

Also I just want to say to my colleagues we had a very impressive morning, we had an opportunity to learn from a man who is a legend, we had an opportunity to begin a relationship of applying the quality of Congress, the executive branch, American culture, which I hope we will continue to foster and develop. I think it was a historic moment. For those of my colleagues and their staffs who could not be there this morning, we did have it videotaped, so it is possible to get a copy of the videotape and to see Dr. Deming on Capitol Hill and see the kind of ideas he has for how we can transform the system in the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATRON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), from July 17 through August 5, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRANDY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on August 1 and 2.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on July 29, 30, 31, August 1 and 2, and September 11, 12, and 13.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRANDY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. BLILEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. COOPER.

Mr. SYNAR.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 751. An act to enhance the literacy and basic skills of adults to ensure that all adults in the United States acquire the basic skills necessary to function effectively and achieve the greatest possible opportunity in their work and in their lives, and to strengthen and coordinate adult literacy programs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

[Inadvertently omitted from the Congressional Record of Thursday, July 18, 1991]

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 427. An act to disclaim any interests of the United States in certain lands on San Juan Island, WA, and for other purposes;

H.R. 998. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, LA, which houses the primary operations of the U.S. Postal Service as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building";

H.R. 2347. An act to redesignate the Midland General Mail Facility in Midland, TX, as the "Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility," and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as the "Korean War Veterans Remembrance Week."

SENATE BILL REFERRED

[Inadvertently omitted from the Congressional Record of Thursday, July 18, 1991]

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 992. An act to provide the reimbursement of certain travel and relocation expenses under title 5, United States Code, for Jane E. Denne of Henderson, NV; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 23, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1784. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Environment), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the DOD Environmental Compliance Program for fiscal year 1992-97, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 342(b)(4) (104 Stat. 1537); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1785. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a status report of outstanding HHS reports to the Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1786. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Oman for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-34), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1787. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-35), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1788. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Morocco for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-33), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1789. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Brazil for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-36), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Mexico (Transmittal No. DTC-39-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1791. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Robert Clark Barkley, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Vice President, Farm Credit Bank of Springfield, Springfield Bank for Cooperatives, transmitting the annual report of the Group Retirement Plan for Agricultural Credit Associations and Farm Credit Banks in the First Farm Credit District, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1794. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting copies of proposed regulations governing the public financing of Presidential primary and general election candidates, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Administration.

1795. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting copies proposed regulations governing disposition of excess campaign or donated funds by

Members of Congress, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Administration.

1796. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1797. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1798. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting copies of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund annual report for fiscal year 1989 and 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1308(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

1799. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the methodology and rationale used to establish a payment rate for the drug erythropoietin [EPO] and a plan for ensuring the appropriateness of rates in the future, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6219(c) (103 Stat. 2254); jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1800. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Medicare coverage denials for home health agency, skilled nursing facility and hospice services, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas:

H.R. 2962. A bill to grant temporary duty-free treatment to fuel grade tertiary butyl alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 2963. A bill to increase the authorized acreage limit for the Assateague Island National Seashore on the Maryland mainland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOWERY of California (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 2964. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration border control through improvements in border enforcement and security; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2965. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to develop a prevention monitoring program for zebra mussels throughout the New York City water supply system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. BILLEY, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

ed States to repeal the 25th amendment to that Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

236. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to on-the-job training subsidies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

237. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to on-the-job training subsidies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

238. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to automatic dialing devices for telephone solicitations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

239. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the Women's Health Equity Act of 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

240. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to applying restrictions to legislative bodies; to the Committee on House Administration.

241. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

242. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Federal impact assistance funds from outer continental shelf oil and gas activities; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 330: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 357: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 393: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 806: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1184: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1226: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1293: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1300: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1385: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1424: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1456: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. KYL, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1472: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 1473: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1768: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1944: Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 2089: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2092: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HORTON, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2218: Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 2294: Mr. RAY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 2550: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2553: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 2579: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2604: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2624: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SABO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 2782: Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2810: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2830: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2879: Mr. PENNY, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2929: Mr. MINETA and Mr. HENRY.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RAY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. YATES, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RIDGE, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCEWEN,

Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 241: Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 264: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. MANTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.J. Res. 293: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HENRY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DYMANLY, Mr. EWING, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.J. Res. 299: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ROE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WISE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BREWSTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the XXII,

103. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Seattle Arts Commission, Seattle, WA, relative to amendments to the Immigration Act of 1990; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.